iGT | UNC

iGT071 - Amendment to the iGT AQ Review Procedures Ancillary Document

Code Administrator's paper for discussion at the iGT071 Work Group 7th June 2016

This Modification was raised to ensure that the above mentioned Ancillary Document was changed so that it is fully compatible with the new arrangements for the industry which will be delivered under Single Service Provision (SSP). The bulk of the current Ancillary Document relates to the process behind an annual review of Annual Quantities (AQs) for Supply Points (AQ Review) and it is generally agreed that this will no longer be required separately within the iGT UNC as Nexus/SSP will introduce a "Rolling AQ" process for the review of these, which will include iGT Supply Points.

However, the Ancillary Document also contains the rules that apply to the revision of the CSEP NExA table. The Work Group has already agreed that this review will need to continue, but whilst this is currently dependent on the results of the Annual AQ review, it will now need to reference summarised data from the "Rolling AQ" process, in addition to other relevant information held by the iGTs.

Further work has been carried out by the iGTs and Xoserve to identify any issues relating to the production of a draft CSEP NExA table. The following table sets outs a number of areas that still need to be fully agreed:

Exclusion		
Criteria	**Question**	**Party**
Infill domestic property AQs.	Will these be provided with a FYAQ from Xoserve? If yes, this is the responsibility of the iGT's to filter out this data from the final report.	Xoserve
Non-domestic property AQs.	Will these be provided with a FYAQ from Xoserve? If yes, this is the responsibility of the iGT's to filter out this data from the final report.	Xoserve
Where an installation read was used in the AQ calculation.	How will iGTs know this from the data received from Xoserve? iGTs solely receive an AQ value.	Xoserve
There was no AQ change because the site became live less than 26 weeks prior to the cut off read date.	How will iGTs know this from the data received from Xoserve? iGTs solely receive an AQ value, and won't know if this has been carried forward from last year, or re-calculated to the same value using valid years.	Xoserve
There were no reads with which to calculate the AQ.	How will iGTs know this from the data received from Xoserve? iGTs solely receive an AQ value, and won't know if this has been	Xoserve

	carried forward from last year or re-calculated to the same value using new reads.	
The AQ changed outside the +100% / -50% tolerance and the Calculated AQ is used as it was not challenged, or challenged unsuccessfully.	Do iGTs still need this criteria? The FYAQ is taken from the SMP AQ which has existing controls around the values it can produce.	Xoserve/Workgroup
AQs changed using the Large Transporter's agent adjustment factors based on the change from the old to new weather correction data.	How will iGTs know this from the data received from Xoserve? iGTs solely receive an AQ value, and won't know if this has been changed due to old to new weather correction data.	Xoserve

Inclusion		
Criteria	**Question**	**Party**
Only properties deemed to be new housing when first connected to a gas connection.	Are there any other exceptions to this rule except for Infill/Commercial properties?	Workgroup
The AQ changed outside the +100% / -50% tolerance, but the new AQ issued as the shipper successfully challenged the old AQ being used.	Do iGTs still need this criteria? The FYAQ is taken from the SMP AQ which has existing controls around the values it can produce.	Xoserve
All other AQ values calculated as part of the most recently completed AQ Review using actual meter reads (for clarity it also includes those above the 2,500 therm threshold).	How will iGTs know this from the data received from Xoserve? iGTs solely receive an AQ value, and won't know if this has been carried forward from last year, or re-calculated using valid reads taken from the gas year.	Xoserve
Only house types that are listed in Section 2 Current Table of the iGT UNC Ancillary Document CSEP NExA Tables.	Is this list still relevant, do values need to be added/removed?	Workgroup

Once the above areas have been agreed it will then be necessary to look at the timing for the production of the consolidated draft CSEP NExA table by the iGTs.

The current document has a date of the 30th November for circulation to Code parties, but this needs to be reviewed depending on the above, and together with any knock-on impacts for the remainder of the process set out in the Ancillary Document.

Appendix 1 sets out the Ancillary document as amended previously by the Modification Work Group.

iGT|UNC

Following further review it has also been identified that a couple of small changes will be required to the iGT039 Legal text:

Part M

"AQ Review Work Group" shall have the meaning as set out in Section 10 of the iGT UNC Ancillary Document entitled the iGT AQ Review Procedures;

Commented [S1]: Whatever the relevant Section is in the cut down Ancillary document - Probably Section 2

"Proposed CSEP NExA Table" shall have the meaning as set out in Section 9 of the iGT UNC Ancillary Document entitled the iGT AQ Review Procedures;

Commented [S2]: As above – probably Section 1

Finally it is the view of the Code Administrator that the NExA Table Reporting Template C1 also needs revision as it is out of date.

iGT | UNC

Appendix 1

iGT AQ Review Procedures Document

An ancillary document to the iGT UNC

Version 1.5

iGT|UNC

Contents

Change History

Version	Change	Date
1.0	First Issue	July 2007
1.1	Designation as an iGT UNC Ancillary Document	November 2011
1.2	Change in line with iGT051ANC	June 2013
1.3	Change in line with iGT049	November 2013
1.4	Change in line with iGT053	October 2014
1.5	Change in line with iGT039	TBC

iGT│UNC

1. Reporting

The following report is generated during the AQ Review for Industry analysis and debate.

a) IGT data collation

IGTs will individually collate AQ data using template C1 using the following rules set out within the template.

- Use one tab per licence held, inputting the average AQ per property type for each of the three geographic areas. Next to this value, input the number of individual supply points used to derive that average.
- IGTs should be reporting from the AQ review output files, not from the overall portfolio. If an AQ has not been reviewed, it should not be part of the dataset.
- The AQ used should only be the final AQ that was taken as the revised AQ value.
- Where an iGT has no values for a type of property the cell AQ and NUMBER must be left BLANK.

- **The following should be EXCLUDED from the AQ data:**
  - Infill domestic property AQs.
  - Non-domestic property AQs.
  - Where an installation read was used in the AQ calculation.
  - There was no AQ change because the site became live less than 26 weeks prior to the cut off read date.
  - There were no reads with which to calculate the AQ.
  - The AQ changed outside the +100% / -50% tolerance and the Calculated AQ is used as it was not challenged, or challenged unsuccessfully.
  - AQs changed using the Large Transporter's agent adjustment factors based on the change from the old to new weather correction data.

- **The following should be INCLUDED in the AQ data:**
  - Only properties deemed to be new housing when first connected to a gas connection.
  - The AQ changed outside the +100% / -50% tolerance, but the new AQ issued as the shipper successfully challenged the old AQ being used.
  - All other AQ values calculated as part of the most recently completed AQ Review using actual meter reads (for clarity it also includes those above the 2,500 therm threshold).

    Commented [S3]: Suggest this is added
  - Only house types that are listed in Section 2 Current Table of the iGT UNC Ancillary Document CSEP NExA Tables.

IGTs will collate the results of each IGT AQ review to create the Proposed CSEP NExA Table using template C2 by November 30th.

Commented [S4]: Workgroup felt that this date was still appropriate – comments requested form the iGTs

iGT AQ Review Procedures

iGT AQ Review Procedures

2. Annual updates to the AQ values within the CSEP NExA Table

Step 1

iGT | UNC

Within 5 Business Days of the collation by the iGTs of the results of the iGT AQ review as in Section 9 above, the Pipeline Operators will arrange and thereafter request the Code Administrator to notify Pipeline Users of the date of an AQ Review Work Group. This meeting will be scheduled to take place within the first fifteen (15) Business Days of January. At the meeting the Pipeline Operators will present the outputs of the AQ review data collation exercise including the Proposed CSEP NExA Table.

> **Commented [S5]:** Currently December. Workgroup suggested changing this to January

Papers and presentations to be discussed at the meeting should be submitted to the Code Administrator at least seven (7) Business Days ahead of the meeting in order to allow attendees sufficient time to review and consider proposals prior to the meeting.

Step 2

At the AQ Review Work Group meeting the outputs of the AQ review data collation exercise including the Proposed CSEP NExA Table will be reviewed and considered. At the meeting, Pipeline Operators and Pipeline Users will be afforded the opportunity to present any evidence or data which challenges the Proposed CSEP NExA Table.

For the avoidance of doubt, any Party who wishes to raise a valid challenge to the Proposed CSEP NExA Table must provide sufficient evidence to do so and must state how this evidence has been produced.

Step 3

The Pipeline Operators will produce a Work Group report for the following February iGT UNC Modification Panel. The report will include the views of the Work Group on whether or not to automatically update the current CSEP NExA Table with the values contained in the Proposed CSEP NExA Table and will include details of any valid challenges that were raised and whether such challenges were withdrawn during the meeting. Following the production of the report a challenge can be withdrawn prior to the consideration of the Work Group report by the Panel, by notice to the Code Administrator.

> **Commented [S6]:** Currently January. Workgroup suggested changing this to February

Step 4

At the February Panel, the Panel will review the AQ Review Work Group report together with any outstanding challenges that have been raised and not withdrawn. The Panel will consider whether the AQ review reports produced by the Pipeline Operators in accordance with Section 9 demonstrate that there are no significant errors and whether the data is largely accurate and reflective of annual consumption patterns. Following such discussion the Panel will be asked to vote on whether there are sufficient concerns for the Proposed CSEP NExA Table not to be implemented. Subject to Step 8, unless there is a Panel Majority against implementation, the Proposed CSEP NExA table will be implemented as a replacement of the current CSEP NExA table in Section 2 Current Table of the iGT UNC Ancillary Document CSEP NExA Tables, in the following June release of the iGT UNC and the Panel will instruct the Code Administrator to circulate an implementation notice to each iGT UNC Operator, each Pipeline User, each Member, each Third Party Participant, each Affected Person (if any) and the Authority within five (5) Business Days of the Panel decision. Such implementation notice will include a copy of the Proposed CSEP NExA Table.

> **Commented [S7]:** Currently January. Workgroup suggested changing this to February

Step 5

iGT | UNC

(Explanatory Note - Steps 5, 6 and 7 will only need to be followed where the February Panel cannot agree implementation.)

Where the February Panel does not agree to implement the Proposed NExA, the concerns raised by the Panel will be documented by the Code Administrator within two (2) Business Days and the Panel will request that the Proposed CSEP NExA Table shall proceed to Consultation in accordance with Clause 23.1 of Part L of the iGT UNC on the basis that the Proposed CSEP NExA Table will be considered to be a Self-Governance Modification Proposal where the Panel has agreed that Legal text does not need to be provided.

Step 6

The normal procedures for a Self-Governance Modification Proposal as per the iGT UNC Modification Rules Clause 23 will be applied and the resulting Final Modification Report will be considered by the April iGT UNC Panel. Subject to Step 8, where there is a Panel Majority for implementation, the Proposed CSEP NExA table will be implemented as a replacement of the current CSEP NExA table in Section 2 Current Table of the iGT UNC Ancillary Document CSEP NExA Tables, in the following November release of the iGT UNC and the Panel will instruct the Code Administrator to circulate an implementation notice to each iGT UNC Operator, each Pipeline User, each Member, each Third Party Participant, each Affected Person (if any) and the Authority within three (3) Business Days of the Panel decision. Such implementation notice will include a copy of the Proposed CSEP NExA Table.

Step 7

Subject to Step 8, where the Panel is unable to reach a decision at the April Panel to implement the Proposed CSEP NExA Table, the Table would not be updated for that year and the Panel will instruct the Code Administrator to circulate a non-implementation notice to each iGT UNC Operator, each Pipeline User, each Member, each Third Party Participant, each Affected Person (if any) and the Authority within three (3) Business Days of the Panel decision.

Step 8 (Appeal Procedures)

Any decision taken by the Panel with regard to the implementation or non-implementation of the Proposed CSEP NExA Table will be subject to Clause 30 of Part L of the iGT UNC (Self-Governance Appeal Procedures). For the purposes of the said paragraph 30, the Proposed CSEP NExA Table change will be considered in an exact same manner as though it were a Self-Governance Modification Proposal and the Self-Governance Modification Proposal Determination Date will be the date of the Panel meeting at which the implementation or non-implementation of the Proposed CSEP NExA Table was agreed.